



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,465	04/21/2004	Shai Fultheim	A-10799.COM/cat	5322
20741	7590	11/26/2008		
HOFFMAN WASSON & GITLER, P.C. CRYSTAL CENTER 2, SUITE 522 2461 SOUTH CLARK STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22202-3843			EXAMINER	
			SILVER, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2128	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
11/26/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/828,465	Applicant(s) FULTHEIM ET AL.
	Examiner DAVID SILVER	Art Unit 2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 were rejected.
2. Claims 1-42 are currently pending in Instant Application.
3. The Instant Application is not currently in condition for allowance.

Priority

4. Claimed priority has been acknowledged in previous Office Action (**9/2/03, 8/11/03**).

Response to Arguments

Response: 35 U.S.C. § 102 / 103

5. Applicants argue:

5.1 Applicants' primary arguments are outlined as follows:

5.1.1 "Bugnion's reference to the use of Disco in the cited passage might refer to running the

Disco VMM over and entire group of workstations (although it is *unlikely* that this was

Bugnion's intent). In this case the system would still consist of a single VMM, not

multiple virtual machine implementers running on different machines as recited in claim

1.

5.1.2 On the other hand, Bugnion could be taken to mean that each workstation in the network runs its own, separate Disco VMM. In this case, however, a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that each workstation also runs its own virtual machine, Bugnion does not teach or suggest in any way that the individual Disco VMMs on the different workstations could together share one virtual machine []." (Remarks: page 2 bottom, to page 3 top; italicized emphasis by Examiner; underlined emphasis is original)

6. Examiner Response:

6.1 Regarding subsection 1 *supra*, the "likeliness" of what is taught by the reference is merely speculative without conclusive evidence to the fact.

6.2 Regarding subsection 2 *supra*, Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are unpersuasive. A computer is defined as: "The physical components from which a computer

Art Unit: 2128

is constructed (electronic circuits and input/output devices) are known as "hardware". Most computers have four types of hardware component: CPU, input, output and memory."

(Source: <http://foldoc.org/index.cgi?query=computer>) Applicants' computers conform to this definition, "computers having respective hardware resources [] comprising a respective memory, and a respective I/O device" (claim 1). Each processor of the multiprocessor system contains, at least, 1) a network, which is equivalent to I/O (inherent for the processors to intercommunicate; see page 418 bottom to 419 top ("interconnect")); and 2) a local memory (commonly known as cache; page 420 section 4.2 paragraph 2 ("memory local to that processor")). Therefore, even without the "networks of workstations" disclosed on the bottom of page 445, the reference teaches the limitations as claimed. However, when implemented with the networks of workstations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that this means, due to its highly analogous nature, each workstation correlates to a single processor within the Disco system, and the network correlates to the interconnect between the workstations. In this case, each computer would have a VMM / VM implementer and they would be aggregated to form at least VM.

6.3 It is further noted, throughout the declaration Applicants appear to also focus on the fact that Disco allows for great flexibility in terms of the number of virtual machines that are implemented, whereas the Claimed Invention is only drawn to a single VM's implementation. Such arguments are unpersuasive. Because Disco can implement multiple VMs, it can inherently implement a single VM.

6.4 Accordingly, in view of the above traversals, the rejection is maintained.

Response: 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Official Notice

7. **Applicants argue:**

7.1 "[] Applicant specifically traverses the Examiner's citation of "official notice" in finding certain claim limitations to be obvious. According to MPEP 2144.03(A), "Official notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be taken by the examiner where the facts asserted to

Art Unit: 2128

be well-known or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known."

7.2 The Examiner has done no more in the present instance, however, than to repeat the added limitations of these dependent claims and then make a conclusory statement that the added limitations are obvious because of the desirable results they achieve. If the Examiner wishes to maintain the rejection of these claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide documentary evidence in support of his allegations or a suitable affidavit or declaration, as required by 37 CFR 1.104." (Remarks: page 4)

8. Examiner Response:

MPEP 2144.03 recites, in part: **To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art.** See 37 C.F.R. 1.111(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate. [...] **If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art** because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate."

8.1 It does not appear that the Applicants attempted to properly traverse the findings, but merely recited how the Official Notice was formulated. Applicants' statements with regards to the Official Notice findings are inadequate because they do not specifically point out the supposed errors in the action. Applicants' statement in subsection 2 *supra*, does not point out an error as to why they believe the officially noted content is not common knowledge or well-known in the art. Therefore, the facts discussed in the Official Notice are taken as admitted prior-art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2128

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

MPEP 2131.01 recites, in part:

"[A] 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection over multiple references has been held to be proper when the extra references are cited to: (A) Prove the primary reference contains an "enabled disclosure;" (B) **Explain the meaning of a term used in the primary reference;** or (C) **Show that a characteristic not disclosed in the reference is inherent."**

9. Claims 1-9, 11, 13-23, 25, 27-34, 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bugnion's "Disco: Running Commodity Operating Systems on Scalable Multiprocessors" ("Disco" / "Bugnion" hereinafter).

Bugnion discloses: 1. A method for executing a software application in a plurality of computers having respective hardware resources said hardware resources comprising a respective memory and a respective I/O device, wherein said computers include a first computer and a second computer that intercommunicate over a network, said computers being operative to execute a virtual machine that runs under a guest operating system, comprising the steps of:

running at least a first virtual machine implementer and a second virtual machine implementer on said first computer and said second computer using said respective memory (**Disco: Fig 1 and description, section 7 "the techniques it uses also apply to more loosely-coupled environments such as networks of workstations (NOW)."**); and

sharing said virtual machine between said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer using said respective I/O device in each of said first computer and said second computer (**Disco: section 4.2.4: "The interposition on all DMA requests offers an opportunity for Disco to share disk and memory resources among virtual machines.; page 2 Fig 1 description: "The multiprocessor consists of a set of processing elements (PE) connected by a high-performance interconnect. Each processing element contains a number of**

processors and a portion of the memory of the machine.”; emphasis by Examiner”.

Bugnion discloses: 2. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of running said software application over said guest operating system, so that commands invoked by said software application are monitored or emulated by said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer on said first computer and said second computer, while said hardware resources of said first computer and said second computer are shared by communication over said network (**Disco: section 3.1, subsection titled "Overheads": "Operations such as the execution of privileged instructions [...] [are] [...] emulated in software by the monitor. Similarly, the access to I/O devices is virtualized, so requests must be intercepted and remapped by the monitor.**).

Bugnion discloses: 3. (original) The method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer is a virtual machine monitor (**Disco: section 1 paragraph 3: "This layer acts like a virtual machine monitor in that multiple copies of "commodity" operating systems can be run on a single scalable computer."**).

Bugnion discloses: 4. (original) The method according to claim i, wherein at least one of said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer is an emulator (**Disco: section 4.1 subsection "Processors" paragraph 1: "Disco correctly emulates all instructions, the memory management unit, and the trap architecture of the processor allowing unmodified applications and existing operating systems to run on the virtual machine."**).

Bugnion discloses: 5. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, wherein at least said first computer comprises a first virtual node comprising a first physical CPU of said first computer and a second virtual node comprising a second physical CPU of said first computer (**Disco: Fig 1 and description, section 7 "the techniques it uses also apply to more**

Art Unit: 2128

loosely-coupled environments such as networks of workstations (NOW)."; Fig 2; section 4 para 1: "consists of a collection of nodes each containing a processor, main memory, and I/O devices.").

Bugnion discloses: 6. (original) The method according to claim 1, wherein said virtual machine comprises a first virtual machine and a second virtual machine, wherein said first virtual machine and said second virtual machine have a plurality of virtual CPU's that are virtualized by said first virtual machine implementer based on a first physical CPU and said second virtual machine implementer based on a second physical CPU, respectively (**Disco: Fig 1; section 3 para 1: "This layer of software, called a virtual machine monitor, virtualizes all the resources of the machine, exporting a more conventional hardware interface to the operating system. The monitor manages all the resources so that multiple virtual machines can coexist on the same multiprocessor."; section 4.1 subsection "Processors": "To match the FLASH machine, the virtual CPUs of Disco provide the abstraction of a MIPS R10000 processor."**; section 4.2.1).

Bugnion discloses: 7. (original) The method according to claim 6, and a first virtual node comprises said first physical CPU and said second physical CPU (**Fig 1, PEs**).

Bugnion discloses: 8. (original) The method according to claim 7, wherein said first virtual machine implementer virtualizes at least one of said virtual CPU's of said first virtual machine based on said first physical CPU and virtualizes at least one of said virtual CPU's in said second virtual machine based on said second physical CPU (**Disco: Fig 1; section 3 para 1: "This layer of software, called a virtual machine monitor, virtualizes all the resources of the machine, exporting a more conventional hardware interface to the operating system."**).

Bugnion discloses: 9. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

providing a management system for said first virtual machine implementer and said

second virtual machine implementer to control said first computer and said second computer node, respectively, wherein said management system comprises a wrapper for receiving calls to a device driver from said first virtual machine implementer, said wrapper invoking said device driver according to a requirement of said first virtual machine implementer (**section 3.1 subsection "Overheads" para 1: "Similarly, the access to I/O devices is virtualized, so requests must be intercepted and remapped by the monitor."**).

Bugnion discloses: 11. (currently amended) The method according to claim 9, further comprising the step of providing a virtual DMA controller for said management system to control a physical DMA controller in one of said computers (**section 4.2.4 titled "Virtual I/O Devices" paragraph 2**).

Bugnion discloses: 13. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

with said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer maintaining mirrors of a portion of said respective memory that is used by said guest operating system in each of said computers (**section 6.3: "Disco simply mirrors the interface of the raw hardware."; Fig 4 and descriptions; section 3 second to last paragraph**);

write-invalidating at least a portion of a page of said respective memory in one of said computers (**section 4.2.2 para 3: " The pmap entry also contains backmaps pointing to the virtual addresses that are used to *invalidate* mappings from the TLB when a page is taken away from the virtual machine by the monitor."**); and transferring a valid copy of said portion of said page to said one computer from another of said computers via said network (**section 4.2.3 paragraph 3: "It first invalidates any TLB entries mapping the old machine page and then copies the data to a local machine page. To replicate a page, the monitor must**

first downgrade all TLB entries mapping the machine page to ensure read-only accesses. It then copies the page to the local node and updates the relevant TLB entries mapping the old machine page.”).

As per claims 14-21 note the rejection of claims 1, and 3-8 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

Bugnion discloses: 22. (currently amended) The computer software product according to claim 14, wherein said computer is further instructed to perform the step of running said software application over said guest operating system, so that commands invoked by said software application are received said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer on said first computer and said second computer, while said hardware resources of said first computer and said second computer are shared by communication over said network (**section 4.2.6 para 3: "specialized network device"; fig 4 item 1; section 7 para 3: "section 7 "the techniques it uses also apply to more loosely-coupled environments such as networks of workstations (NOW)."**).

As per claims 23, 25, 27 note the rejection of claims 9, and 11, 13 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

As per claims 28, note the rejection of claims 1, 2, 22 above. The Instant Claim recites substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and is therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

As per claims 29-31, note the rejection of claims 22, 8, 7 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

Bugnion discloses: 32. (currently amended) The computer system according to claim 31, wherein said first computer comprises a first processor and a second processor, a first I/O device and a

Art Unit: 2128

second I/O device, wherein said first I/O device is assigned to said first processor, and said second I/O device is assigned to said second processor (**section 3.1 subsection**

"Overheads": "Similarly, the access to I/O devices is virtualized, so requests must be intercepted and remapped by the monitor."; **section 4 para 1: "The FLASH multiprocessor consists of a collection of nodes each containing a processor, main memory, and I/O devices.";** **section 4.1 subsection titled "I/O Devices", section 4.2.1 para 1).**

Bugnion discloses: 33. (currently amended) The computer system according to claim 28, further comprising a minimal operating system executing in each of said computers nodes to invoke said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer so that said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer control said computers nodes (**Fig 1 item "ThinOS" and description; section 4.4 running a thin OS (minimal OS).**)

As per claims 34, 36-37, note the rejection of claims 9, 11, 13 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

Bugnion discloses: 38. The method according to claim 1, wherein said guest operating system consists of exactly one instance of a single guest operating system (**Fig 1: element "Disco"**).

As per claims 39, note the rejection of claims 38 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

Bugnion discloses: 40. The method according to claim 1, wherein said first virtual machine implementer and said second virtual machine implementer are operative to present said respective memory of said first computer and said respective memory of said second computer as a single shared memory to said guest operating system, the method further comprising the step of distributing instructions of said guest operating system to said single shared memory (**Fig**

Art Unit: 2128

1 description: "The multiprocessor consists of a set of processing elements (PE) connected by a high-performance interconnect. Each processing element contains a number of processors and a portion of the memory of the machine."; emphasis by Examiner; page 4 section 4.1 titled "Physical Memory" - "Disco provides an abstraction of main memory"; section 4.2 "Disco is implemented as a multi-threaded shared memory program".

As per claims 41-42, note the rejection of claims 40 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 10, 12, 24, 26, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bugnion (**US 6075938 A**) ("Patent" hereinafter) and Bugnion's "Disco: Running Commodity Operating Systems on Scalable Multiprocessors" ("Disco" hereinafter) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Official Notice taken.

As per claim 10, Bugnion fully discloses claim 9. Bugnion however does not expressly disclose the step of providing a virtual PCI controller for said management system to control a physical PCI controller in one of said computers. Official Notice is taken with respect to this limitation. It

Art Unit: 2128

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art <computer engineer / simulation / virtual machines / virtual machine monitors> at the time of Applicant's invention to combine the features in order to allow for an extensible platform which can be expanded with PCI cards/adapters; thus, saving money associated with having to rebuild a customized system when expansions are required and no adapters are available. Furthermore, having a virtual PCI controller such that the virtual machines can communicate with the actual machine's PCI controller which are routinely used for, for example, sounds cards, video cards, and other I/O devices. In fact, Bugnion discloses virtualized I/O in section 4.2.4 titled "Virtual I/O Devices". As per claim 12, Bugnion fully discloses claim 11 and identifying devices having on-board i0 DMA controllers (**section 4.2.2 para 4; section 4.2.4 para 2: "Devices such as disks and network interfaces include a DMA map as part of their arguments. Disco must intercept such DMA requests to translate the physical addresses specified by the operating systems into mac**). Bugnion however does not expressly disclose providing a virtual PCI controller to control a physical PCI controller in one of said computers; and during a bootup phase of operation scanning a device list. Official Notice is taken with respect to these limitations. The PCI controller limitation has been addressed in claim 10 above. It would have been obvious to perform the scanning during the bootup such that the DMA devices could be instantly usable, rather than wasting time and money associated therewith while the system performs scanning later. Rather, it would be more convenient to have the scanning done while the system is starting up.

As per claims 24, 26, 35, note the rejection of claims 10, 12 above. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the above-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-art teachings.

Support for Amendments and Newly Added Claims

Applicants are respectfully requested, in the event of an amendment to claims or submission of new claims, that such claims and their limitations be directly mapped to the specification, which

Art Unit: 2128

provides support for the subject matter. This will assist in expediting compact prosecution.

MPEP 714.02 recites: "Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06. An amendment which does not comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121(b), (c), (d), and (h) may be held not fully responsive. See MPEP § 714." **Amendments not pointing to specific support in the disclosure may be deemed as not complying with provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.131(b), (c), (d), and (h) and therefore held not fully responsive.** Generic statements such as "Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced" may be deemed insufficient.

Requests for Interview

11. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(a)(3), requests for interview must be made in advance. Interview requests are to be made by telephone (571-272-8634) call or FAX (571-273-8634). Applicants must provide a detailed agenda as to what will be discussed (generic statement such as "discuss §102 rejection" or "discuss rejections of claims 1-3" may be denied interview). The detail agenda along with any proposed amendments is to be written on a PTOL-413A or a custom form and should be faxed (or emailed, subject to MPEP 713.01.I / MPEP 502.03) to the Examiner at least 3 days prior to the scheduled interview.
12. Interview requests submitted within amendments may be denied because the Examiner was not notified, in advance, of the Applicant Initiated Interview Request and due to time constraints may not be able to review the interview request to prior to the mailing of the next Office Action.

Conclusion

13. All claims are rejected.
14. The Instant Application is not currently in condition for allowance.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2128

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Silver whose telephone number is (571) 272-8634. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 10am to 6:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on 571-272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/ DS /

David Silver, Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2128

/Hugh Jones/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2128